



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,124	04/19/2004	Young Sun Lee		2312
59259 ITALIA IP 3500 WEST OLIVE AVE. SUITE 300 BURBANK, CA 91505	7590 09/05/2008		EXAMINER BLAIR, KILE O	
			ART UNIT 2615	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/827,124

**Applicant(s)**

LEE, YOUNG SUN

**Examiner**

Kile O. Blair

**Art Unit**

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is in response to the communication filed on July 16, 2008.  
Claims 1-8 have been canceled. New claims 9-20 are pending.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: "An" should be "A".  
Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by  
"TASCAM TEAC Professional Division M-08 Compact Mixer Owner's manual", April 19, 2003, 16 pages (hereinafter as Tascam).

Regarding claim 9, Tascam teaches a receiver device capable of receiving signals from multiple components and transmission of said signals to a speaker (M-08, Fig. E1), said device comprising:

- (a) a first input for receiving a signal from a first component (line in on channel strip in Fig. E5, Pg. 7);
- (b) a first set of bass and treble controls to directly control signals from said first

component (high and low controls on channel strip, Fig. E5, Pg. 7);

(c) a first on and off switch for activating said first set of bass and treble controls and allowing the transmission of said signal from said first component to said speaker (mute switch, Fig. E5, Pg. 7);

(d) a second input for receiving a signal from a second component;

(e) a second set of bass and treble controls to directly control signals from said second component; and,

(f) a second on and off switch for activating said second set of bass and treble controls and allowing the transmission of said signal from said second component to said speaker (elements d, e, and f are shown in the second set of the input and controls on another of the channels from Fig. E7, pg. 8 as cited above (elements a-c) in the rejection to claim 9 for the first channel).

Regarding claim 10, Tascam teaches the device of claim 9, further comprising

(a) a master volume control for controlling the volume to the speaker (master fader 21, Fig. E7); (b) a power control for powering the device on or off (power 22, Fig. E7); and, (c) a balance control for controlling the transmission of a component's signal to two or more speakers (level switches 12 for each channel, Fig. E7).

Regarding claim 11, Tascam teaches the device of claim 9, wherein a user is able to manually set the treble and bass controls for a first component and manually set the treble and bass for a second component such that when a user switches from said first and second component, the settings for each components are maintained (mixing board, Fig. E7).

Regarding claim 12, Tascam teaches the device claim 9, wherein the input for the first component and the first set of treble and bass controls are in a substantially linear arrangement such that said elements form a first strip within the device (first channel strip, Fig. E7).

Regarding claim 13, Tascam teaches the device of claim 12, wherein the input for the second component and the second set of treble and bass controls are in a substantially linear arrangement such that said elements form a second strip within the device (second channel strip, Fig. E7).

Regarding claim 14, Tascam teaches the device claim 9, wherein when said first and second on and off switches are switched to the on position, the signals from the first and second components are transmitted to the speaker simultaneously (when mute switches 10 in respective channels are not muting signal, Fig. E7).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tascam in view of Skulski (US Pat. No. D257,037).

Regarding claim 15, Tascam teaches the device of claim 9 further comprising a bottom panel (bottom panel, Fig. E16); (c) a pair of side panels integral and

perpendicular to said bottom panel (side panels where only one is explicitly shown, Fig. E16); (d) a front panel integral with and between said side panels, and (e) a rear panel integral with and between said side panels (front and rear panels, Fig. E16).

Although Tascam does not explicitly disclose that the device of claim 9 further comprises the features of: (a) a top panel devoid of any controls or inputs; (b) a bottom panel parallel to said top panel; (c) the pair of side panels are integral and perpendicular to the top panel as well as the bottom panel (d) wherein the front panel comprises an upper portion and a lower portion, wherein the upper portion is integral with said top panel and forms an angle of more than 90 degrees, wherein the lower portion is integral with said bottom panel and forms an angle of 90 degrees and (e) wherein the rear panel comprises an upper portion and a lower portion; wherein the upper portion is integral with said top panel and forms an angle of more than 90 degrees, and wherein the lower portion is integral with said bottom panel and forms an angle of 90 degrees, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the features of Tascam on a housing such as one similar to Skulski while also adding another angled rear panel since the rear panel of Tascam is angled. The combination of Tascam in view of Skulski teaches the features not taught by Tascam alone.

Tascam in view of Skulski teaches: (a) a top panel devoid of any controls or inputs (Skulski, Fig. 5); (b) a bottom panel parallel to said top panel (Skulski, Fig. 6); (c) the pair of side panels are integral and perpendicular to the top panel as well as the bottom panel (side panels where only one is explicitly shown, Skulski, Fig. 2); (d) wherein the front panel comprises an upper portion and a lower portion, wherein the

upper portion is integral with said top panel and forms an angle of more than 90 degrees, wherein the lower portion is integral with said bottom panel and forms an angle of 90 degrees (front panel, Skulski, Fig. 1), and the combined teachings of Tascam in view of Skulski suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art also providing a rear panel such that (e) the rear panel comprises an upper portion and a lower portion; wherein the upper portion is integral with said top panel and forms an angle of more than 90 degrees, and wherein the lower portion is integral with said bottom panel and forms an angle of 90 degrees (in a similar fashion to the front panel of Skulski or the rear panel of Tascam).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it readily apparent to place the features of Tascam into a housing such as the one disclosed by Skulski since doing so would have been a matter of obvious design choice.

Regarding claim 16, all features of claim 16 coextensive with claim 15 are rejected for the same reasons as given in the rejection to claim 15. Those features not disclosed are rejected as follows: wherein said first input is located on said upper portion of said rear panel, (input on the front panel of Skulski which represents the rear panel in the combination of Tascam in view of Skulski, Skulski, Fig.1; it is noted that although it is not clear that the round element on the left of the front panel of the amplifier of Skulski is an input, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place an input in that location); wherein said first controls are located on said upper portion of said front panel (the controls on the front/top panel of Tascam {Fig. E15} combined with the front panel controls of Skulski {Fig. 1}); and wherein said first on

and off switch is located on said upper portion of said front panel (the muting switch on the front/top panel of Tascam {Fig. E15} combined with the front panel controls of Skulski {Fig. 1}). It is noted that it would have been obvious to place the front/top or rear panel features of Tascam on the front panel of Tascam in view of Skulski, or on the lower panel as a matter of design choice.

Regarding claim 17, Tascam in view of Skulski teaches the device of claim 16, further comprising:

- (a) a master volume control for controlling the volume to the speaker, wherein said volume control is located on said lower portion of said front panel (fader 21, Tascam, Fig. E7);
- (b) a power control for powering the device on or off, wherein said power control is located on said lower portion of said front panel (power 22, Tascam, Fig. E8); and,
- (c) a balance control for controlling the transmission of a component's signal to two or more speakers, wherein said balance control is located on said lower portion of said front panel (level 12, Tascam, Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 18, it would have been obvious to add another channel of features corresponding to a second input device as a duplication of parts.

Regarding claim 19, Tascam in view of Skulski teaches the device of claim 18, wherein a user is able to manually set the treble and bass controls for a first component and manually set the treble and bass for a second component such that when a user switches from said first and second component, the settings for each components are maintained (operation of EQ high 3 and low 4 knobs in Fig. E7 of Tascam).



Regarding claim 20, Tascam in view of Skulski teaches the device claim 18, wherein the input for the first component and the first set of treble and bass controls are in a substantially linear arrangement such that said elements form a first strip within the device, and wherein the input for the second component and the second set of treble and bass controls are in a substantially linear arrangement such that said elements form a second strip within the device (Tascam, Fig. E7).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. There was no claim 8 presented in the original set of claims so no remarks were made regarding a claim 8.

Applicant argues that claim 9 recites a receiver and so the Tascam M-08 mixer is not a relevant piece of art because it is not a receiver, however the Tascam M-08 meets the definition of receiver as provided in the remarks except for the feature of amplification, however claim 9 is not limiting to a receiver that must provide *substantial amplification* of signals for reproduction in a set of speakers, therefore the examiner asserts that the Tascam M-08 is a receiver in claim 9, especially since it is fully capable of doing the specific receiving that is recited in the claim.

Regarding applicant's assertion that Tascam does not show a slightly slanted back panel, the examiner points out Figures E8 and E16 as evidence of the slightly slanted back panel.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kile O. Blair whose telephone number is (571) 270-3544. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (571) 272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

/Vivian Chin/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2615